

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 29-32 have been amended to recite a computer readable recording medium. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims now define statutory subject matter.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 and 20 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this objection moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 12, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoo (WO 01/55897).

Claims 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 26, 31 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo (WO 01/55897).

Claims 4, 11, 13, 15, 28, 33 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo (WO 01/55897) in view of Nielson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,502).

These rejections are respectfully traversed, in view of the amendments discussed below in connection with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 18-23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations recited in allowable dependent claim 20 and intervening dependent claim 15. Claims 15 and 20 have been cancelled.

The dependency of claims 16 and 21 has been amended to conform to the cancellation of claims 15 and 20.

Claims 4, 11, 13, and 18 have been cancelled. The dependency of claim 19 has been amended to conform to the cancellation of claim 18.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the limitations recited in claim 20 and 28. Independent claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations recited in claim 20 and claim 33. Independent claim 34 has been amended to include the limitations recited in claim 20 and claim 38.

Claims 28, 33 and 38 have been cancelled

In view of these amendments it is respectfully submitted that all claims now incorporate subject matter that has been found to be allowable. Therefore all claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 5259-000035/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory A. Sloops
Registration No.: 28,764
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1214
Attorney for Applicant